

### REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action mailed August 4, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as "the Office Action"). Claims 1-12 were pending at the time of the last examination, and stand rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1-11 are currently amended, Claim 12 is cancelled, and Claims 13 and 14 are new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections in light of the following remarks and the accompanying amendments.

Section 1 of the Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States patent number 6,259,782 issued to Gallant (hereinafter referred to simply as "Gallant"). Section 2 of the Office Action rejected the remaining claims, Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallant in view of United States patent publication number US 2001/0039188 applied for by Amereller et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Amereller").

#### Summary of Gallant

Gallant discloses a one-number communications system for allowing a subscriber to receive calls to designated wireless or wireline communications terminals (see Gallant, from line 56 of column 6 through line 55 of column 7). In Figs. 2 and 3 of Gallant, a single telephone number 180 is associated with the subscriber's terminals, such as a wireline terminal 102 with an identification number 182 and a wireless terminal 110 with an identification number 112. The single telephone number 180 is assigned to a calling priority scheme 190 that is formed of a plurality of calling priorities.

When a request for call completion is made to the single telephone number 180, any one of the subscriber's terminals is designated to call based on the calling priorities, such as a time

and day priority 206 that is allocated to allow the subscriber's selected terminals to be active at given days and times.

#### Summary of Amereller

Amereller discloses a method that provides automatic control of call diversion from a first terminal (TEG) to a desired second terminal (MEG) via a switching device (V) (see Amereller, page 3, columns [0030] to [0031]. In Fig 2, when a base station BSI confirms that a mobile terminal MEG has left a radio cell FZI by comparing radio signals with a predetermined limit value, a message M is sent to the switching device V. Call diversion is identified as being active based on an activation status A in a call diversion table TAB of the switching device V.

Thus, a switching assembly RC switches all incoming connection requests VA2 for a table terminal TEG to the mobile terminal MEG via the base station BS2.

#### Comparison to current independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11.

Each of the independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 11 recites that the switching control is performed by using a shared number at one subscriber side. That is, when a plurality of mobile terminals sharing the same number are shared by one subscriber (USER A), the subscriber switches a communicating mobile terminal to another authenticated mobile terminal so that the authenticated mobile terminal (= A2 of USER A) sharing the same number instead of the authenticating mobile terminal (= A1 of USER A) communicates with a terminal used by another subscriber (= other USERS except USER A).

Gallant is featured in that subscriber terminals are associated with the single telephone number 180, and anyone of them is designated based on the calling priorities of the calling priority scheme 190. Amereller et al. is featured in that call diversion from the base station BS1

to the base station BS2 is performed base on the switching device V including the radio switching assembly RC and the call diversion table TAB.

However, Gallant and Amereller do not teach the feature of claims 1, 5, 9 and 11 of the present invention that "authentication process" for switching connection between a plurality of mobile terminals sharing the same number is performed at the same subscriber side (i.e. terminals A1 and A2 of USER A).

Therefore, Gallant and Amereller, either singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the independent claims as amended.<sup>1</sup> The other claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 13 and 14 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of these corresponding independent claims, and are thus not unpatentable over Gallant or Gallant in view of Amereller at least for the reasons provided for their corresponding independent claim. Therefore, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of October, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



Adrian J. Lee  
Registration No. 42,785  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913

---

<sup>1</sup> It is not necessary at this time to argue against the combination of Gallant and Amereller as even the combination does not teach or suggested all of the recited features in the independent claims. Accordingly, the lack of arguments in this response should not be deemed as acquiescing that the combination is appropriate. The applicants may argue against the combination should this become necessitated by future office action.